

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

PAUL PARKS,

Petitioner,

v.

STEVEN GLUNT,
THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY OF THE
COUNTY OF PHILADELPHIA, and
THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE
STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA,
Respondents.

CIVIL ACTION

NO. 15-526

ORDER

AND NOW, this 15th day of November, 2023, upon consideration of Petitioner Paul Parks's Motion for Relief from Judgment under Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(1) (ECF No. 67), Petitioner's Request for Status of Rule 60(b) Motion (ECF No. 68), and for the reasons set forth in the accompanying Memorandum, **IT IS ORDERED** as follows:

1. Petitioner's Motion (ECF No. 67) is **DENIED**.
2. Petitioner's Request (ECF No. 68) is **DENIED AS MOOT**.
3. A certificate of appealability will not issue because reasonable jurists would not debate (a) this Court's decision that Petitioner's Rule 60(b)(1) motion is untimely and an impermissible second or successive habeas petition, (b) this Court's decision that the petition does not state a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right, or (c) the propriety of this Court's procedural ruling with respect to petitioner's claims. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2); *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000).

BY THE COURT:

/s/ **Hon. Kelley B. Hodge**

HODGE, KELLEY B., J.